# U.S. Department of Education 2012 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program

A Public School - 12NY6

| School Type (Public Schools): (Check all that apply, if any)      | Charten               | T:41a 1       | Magnet             | Chaire   |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------|--|
|   | Charter               | Title 1       | Magnet             | Choice   |
| Name of Principal: Mr. Gerald                                     | Eckert                |               |                    |  |
| Official School Name: Barker                                      | Road Middle S         | <u>School</u> |                    |  |
| School Mailing Address:   | 75 Barker Road        | <u>l</u>      |                    |  |
| <u>]</u>  | Pittsford, NY 1       | 4534-2929     |                    |  |
| County: Monroe  | State School Co       | ode Number*   | : <u>261401060</u> | 008  |
| Telephone: (585) 267-1802   | E-mail: <u>gerald</u> | eckert@pit    | tsford.monroe      | <u>edu</u>   |
| Fax: (585) 385-5960   | Web site/URL:         | http://pittsf | ordschools.org     | y/BRMS.cfm   |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and |                       |               |                    | ty requirements on page 2 (Part II) information is accurate. |
|   |                       |               | ]                  | Date   |
| (Principal's Signature)   |                       |               |                    |  |
| Name of Superintendent*: Ms. maryalice_price@pittsford.mon        | -                     | ice Superin   | tendent e-mail     | :  |
| District Name: Pittsford CSD                                      | District Phone:       | : (585) 267-1 | 000                |  |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and | * *                   |               | ~                  | ty requirements on page 2 (Part is accurate.                 |
|   |                       |               | ]                  | Date   |
| (Superintendent's Signature)                                      |                       |               |                    |  |
| Name of School Board Preside                                      | nt/Chairperson:       | : Mr. Brent K | <u>Kecskemety</u>  |  |
| I have reviewed the information - Eligibility Certification), and |                       |               |                    | ty requirements on page 2 (Part is accurate.                 |
|   |                       |               | ]                  | Date   |
| (School Board President's/Cha                                     | irperson's Sign       | ature)        |                    |  |

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

<sup>\*</sup>Non-Public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

- 1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
- 2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
- 3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2011-2012 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
- 4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take foreign language courses.
- 5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2006.
- 6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 or 2011.
- 7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
- 8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
- 9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
- 10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## All data are the most recent year available.

#### **DISTRICT**

- 1. Number of schools in the district 5 Elementary schools (includes K-8) (per district designation): 2 Middle/Junior high schools 2 High schools 6 K-12 schools 7 Total schools in district 2. District per-pupil expenditure: 18262
- **SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)
- 3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: <u>Suburban</u>
- 4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school:
- 5. Number of students as of October 1, 2011 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

| Grade | # of Males                    | # of Females | Grade Total |  |    | # of Males | # of Females | Grade Total |
|-------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--|----|------------|--------------|-------------|
| PreK  | 0                             | 0            | 0           |  | 6  | 133        | 115          | 248         |
| K     | 0                             | 0            | 0           |  | 7  | 106        | 131          | 237         |
| 1     | 0                             | 0            | 0           |  | 8  | 123        | 134          | 257         |
| 2     | 0                             | 0            | 0           |  | 9  | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 3     | 0                             | 0            | 0           |  | 10 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 4     | 0                             | 0            | 0           |  | 11 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
| 5     | 0                             | 0            | 0           |  | 12 | 0          | 0            | 0           |
|       | Total in Applying School: 742 |              |             |  |    |            |              |             |

| 6. Racial/ethnic com  |   | n India                      | an or Alaska Native  |
|---|---|------------------------------|--|
|   |   |                              |  |
|   | 3 % Black or  | Africa                       | an American  |
|   | 4 % Hispanic  | or La                        | tino   |
|   | 0 % Native H  | awaiia                       | an or Other Pacific Islander   |
|   | 80 % White  |                              |  |
|   | 1 % Two or n  | nore ra                      | aces   |
|   | 100 % Total   |                              |  |
|   |   |                              |  |
| school. The final Gu Department of Educ each of the seven car  7. Student turnover, This rate is calcul | or mobility rate, during the 2010-2011 schated using the grid below. The answer to                                | eportir<br>ederal<br>nool ye | ag Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Register provides definitions for ear:  0% |
| (1)   | Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2010 until the end of the school year.   | 2                            |  |
| (2)   | Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2010 until the end of the school year. | 2                            |  |
| (3)   | Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].  | 4                            |  |
| (4)   | Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2010  | 742                          |  |
| (5)   | Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).                                       | 0.00                         |  |

| 8. Percent of English Language Learners in the school: | 0% |
|--|----|
| Total number of ELL students in the school:            | 1  |
| Number of non-English languages represented:           | 1  |
| Specify non-English languages:                         |    |
|  |    |

Chinese

(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.

| 9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: | 4% |
|--|----|
| Total number of students who qualify:                          | 30 |

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

| 10. Percent of students receiving special education services: | 9% |
|---|----|
| Total number of students served:                              | 71 |

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

| 7 Autism                | Orthopedic Impairment                   |
|-------------------------|---|
| 0 Deafness              | 25 Other Health Impaired                |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness        | 22 Specific Learning Disability         |
| 3 Emotional Disturbance | 10 Speech or Language Impairment        |
| 1 Hearing Impairment    | 2 Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| 0 Mental Retardation    | 0 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 1 Multiple Disabilities | Developmentally Delayed                 |

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

Number of Staff

|  | <b>Full-Time</b> | <b>Part-Time</b> |
|--|------------------|------------------|
| Administrator(s)   | 2                | 0                |
| Classroom teachers   | 38               | 1                |
| Resource teachers/specialists (e.g., reading specialist, media specialist, art/music, PE teachers, etc.) | 27               | 15               |
| Paraprofessionals  | 24               | 0                |
| Support staff (e.g., school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria aides, etc.)                              | 22               | 1                |
| Total number   | 113              | 17               |

| 12 | . Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school |
|----|---|
|    | divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:                          |

20:1

13. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

|                             | 2010-2011 | 2009-2010 | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Daily student attendance    | 97%       | 97%       | 96%       | 97%       | 96%       |
| High school graduation rate | %         | %         | %         | %         | %         |

| 14  | For | schools | ending in | grade 1 | 2 (high          | schools | ١: |
|-----|-----|---------|-----------|---------|------------------|---------|----|
| ıT. | TUI | SCHOOLS | chung in  | grauti  | <i>4</i> (111211 | SCHOOLS | ,. |

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2011 are doing as of Fall 2011.

| Graduating class size:                     |                |
|--|----------------|
| Enrolled in a 4-year college or university | %              |
| Enrolled in a community college            | <del></del> %  |
| Enrolled in vocational training            | <del></del> %  |
| Found employment                           | <del></del> %  |
| Military service                           | <del></del> %  |
| Other                                      | <del></del> %  |
| Total                                      | <del></del> 0% |

| 15. | Indicate | whether | your scho | ol has | previously | y received | a National | Blue | Ribbon | Schools | award |
|-----|----------|---------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|------------|------|--------|---------|-------|
|     |          |         |           |        |            |            |            |      |        |         |       |

| 0 | No  |
|---|-----|
| 0 | Yes |

If yes, what was the year of the award?

The Pittsford Central School District has a proud tradition as a leader in education both at the state and national level. Barker Road Middle School shares this tradition. Just this past month, Barker Road was reauthorized as a Essential Elements Middle School to Watch due to our continued commitment to excellence. However, our greatest strength lay not in our past accomplishments, but in our continual effort to improve so that Barker Road remains an exemplary school, worthy of Blue Ribbon status.

Barker Road Middle School values its strong partnership with the community it is proud to serve, sharing in the key values that make a school truly exceptional. Barker Road draws from a strong, suburban community outside Rochester, New York. Collaboration with staff, parents and the community is critical to our school's success; we understand education is a shared responsibility among parents, community and the school. Each year, our district PTSA conducts a Super Sale in cooperation with the schools. Money raised supports efforts of the PTSA to support our students. As a school district, we also actively engage in promoting healthy choices for our students through the Pittsford Alliance for a Substance Free Youth. This alliance, made up of community members from the town, PTSA, faith community and Pittsford Youth Services, an organization designed to support families and youth in need, helps coordinate efforts in the community to provide students with healthy activities that promote a drug-free lifestyle. As an extension, each secondary school has a social worker from Pittsford Youth Services who comes to the school twice a week to support students in need in direct cooperation with the district.

At Barker Road, we believe that all students, each with unique abilities and talents, should reach their potential and become responsible, productive citizens. To achieve this, we understand that a highly skilled, well educated staff is critical to student success and that our staff must continually improve their practice in support of student learning. To that end, we have embraced both the Common Core Learning Standards and the new Annual Professional Performance Review process with a careful eye on how our work related to these critical initiatives can improve teaching and learning. Our building improvement plan specifically embraces the CCLS as an avenue to draw critical connections among the disciplines as we prepare our students for college and the world of work. Our collective focus on literacy and math is a key to our efforts to improve student achievement.

We also understand that not all students learn in the same way or at the same rate. Response to Intervention has been a critical tool in assisting those students who struggle to meet the learning standards. Utilizing our team structure, teachers work together to assess student learning and establish an individual plan to support each student. We recently began work with a software program that will assist us in tracking student data as students progress through elementary, middle and high school. This will improve communication and enhance collaboration, all with a focus on improving student success.

It is not enough to prepare students for the world in which they live today. An effective educational system anticipates, plans and acts in response to a changing world. At Barker Road, we are working to incorporate technology into our curriculum in a way that makes sense to our students. For example, our students are engaged in the appropriate use of social networking via Edmodo, a valuable tool that enhances communication between and among teacher and students, fostering a true community of learners.

Though students at Barker Road have enjoyed a history of academic success, we continually seek to improve our practice. Research and evaluation are central to a quality school system. Our district recently engaged in collecting survey data in conjunction with the National Center for School Leadership; this process included gathering input from staff, parents and students, grades 6 - 12. Our Collaborative

Inquiry Team is currently working with this data to inform our building improvement plans. It is through gathering and analyzing such critical data that we understand our strengths and identify areas for improvement.

Perhaps the greatest strength of Barker Road is our shared attention to our Core Principles, principles that make up our school mission and guide the daily work of our staff and students. Those Core Principles are: Caring/Kindness, Fairness/Justice, Responsibility, Respect, Perseverance, Trustworthiness/Integrity. We believe that emphasizing these positive characteristics is the best way to maintain a safe and secure educational environment. Our goal is for each student to feel safe and welcome at Barker Road every day, without exception. We do not tolerate bullying, but more important, we work continually to foster positive relationships among students and staff in a continued effort to build upon a truly positive environment.

Our district and school vision states, "As an educational leader with uncompromising commitment and passion for excellence, Pittsford Central Schools will deliver quality programs and services that maximize academic performance and personal development, and provide for each child's future success." By building upon a strong tradition of success, working as a community of learners and continually seeking to improve our practice, we we will realize this vision and through our efforts we believe Barker Road Middle School will prove worthy of Blue Ribbon status. Thank you.

#### 1. Assessment Results:

A. Each year, students in grades 6 – 8 participate in the New York State Testing Program for both Mathematics and English/Language Arts. Performance is measured on a scale of one through four. Level 1 is defined as not meeting standards, level 2 is defined as meeting standards at a basic level, level 3 is defined as meeting standards at a proficient level and level 4 is defined as meeting standards at a high level or advanced level of proficiency.

Students at Barker Road have traditionally performed well on these state assessments. Consequently, we view success as defined by performance at a level 3 or 4. When students perform at a basic level, we work as a collaborative team to determine specific areas for improvement and, utilizing the RtI process, develop an individualized plan to address those specific areas of need. Through this process, we seek to have 100% of our students performing at the proficient or highly proficient level on all state assessments.

B. Achievement trends, based upon state testing data, have generally been consistent at Barker Road in the areas of math and ELA over the past five years, with the exception of the 2009 – 2010 school year, when scores were lower. It should be noted that for the 2009-2010 school year results, the New York State Education Department raised the English language arts and math cut scores for the Basic and Proficient performance levels. Raising the bar in this manner has caused a statewide drop in the percent of students scoring at proficiency levels 3 and 4. A student scoring at or above the new Basic standard (Level 2) is on track to pass the English or math Regents exam required for high school graduation. A student scoring at or above the new Proficiency standard (Level 3) is on track to earn a college-ready score on the English or math Regents Examination. In the July 28, 2010 news release, Senior Deputy Commissioner for P-12 Education John King stated, 'These newly defined cut scores do not mean that students who were previously scoring at the Proficient standard and are now labeled Basic have learned less. Rather, the lower numbers of students meeting the Proficient standard reflects that we are setting the bar higher and we expect students, teachers, and parents to reach even higher to achieve these new targets.' Additional information can be found in the news release materials at: http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Grade3-8 Results07282010.html and http://www.oms.nysed.gov/press/Regents\_Approve\_Scoring\_Changes.html

Even with our level of consistency, we recognize a gap between the performance of our general population and sub-populations, the most consistent being with our special education students. This has been a focus of our professional development and strategic planning work. We continue to move to a more inclusive environment, seeking to serve as many students in the general education setting as possible. This has lead to greater collaboration between special education and general education teachers, often through a team teaching model. In addition, students who might have previously been served through alternative programming are returning to Barker Road, their home school. We believe this is in the best interest of the individual child and the school.

We have revised our model for instructional support in part as a response to the gaps in achievement. Our goal is to provide instruction in the classroom setting, using the RtI model. To this end, teachers have worked in teams to develop methods of recording, tracking and analyzing data on formative assessments to inform instruction. Within this work, we have been consciously focused on the performance of students in our sub-populations in an effort to better assess their progress and address their needs; state assessment data is one tool that informs our work.

With regards to all of our students, but again with a conscious eye on the performance of students in our subgroups, we have placed greater emphasis on transition to and from middle school. We have transition teams, which consist of teachers at the sixth and eighth grade level, who meet regularly with teachers at

the fifth and ninth grade respectively. These transition teams then meet with their grade level peers to share information. The goal is to develop greater clarity with regards to vertical alignment as well as examining student data to better prepare ourselves to meet the needs of incoming sixth grade students who have been identified as needing additional academic support.

Despite our students' success on state assessments, we continue to strive to improve through analysis of student data that informs changes in our professional practice. Our goal is always to better meet the needs of all students.

#### 2. Using Assessment Results:

Data driven instruction and decision making has been a key strategic initiative in Pittsford and at Barker Road Middle School for many years. Data has been key to informing and improving teaching and learning as well as in communicating student achievement to parents, students and the community. Through the use of state assessment data, common formative assessments, integration of technology in classroom instruction, availability of grades and embedded professional development focused on a standards based approach to instruction, which centers on the systematic use of assessment, Barker is devoted to using data to improve teaching and learning.

Like many schools, Barker Road staff review state assessment data each year to identify students at risk, students prepared for enrichment, along with program strengths and weaknesses. This process occurs at several levels within our system. Departments review data from state assessments in their area to inform program development. This has resulted in some curriculum revision. For example, beginning with the 2009-10 assessment data analysis, both ELA and social studies teachers met to review the complexity of text being taught at each grade level to ensure that there was an appropriate progression as students proceeded through middle school. This has aligned well with the theme of the CCLS and provided a jump-start to our efforts towards alignment with the new standards.

Common formative assessments are given in each curricular area. Through our district standards leaders, who are organized by standard area, teams of teachers meet to develop and grade each assessment. Through this process, a systematic review of curriculum and assessment is built into the program. Results from these common formative assessments, which occur at least twice a year, are used at the district and building level to inform instruction. For example, our 8th grade social studies teachers met with district colleagues to revise the midterm exam in accordance with our efforts to increase text complexity. A recent review of data from the midterm revealed growth in students' ability to respond to document based questions; however, in the area of constructed response, we did not see the growth we would have liked to see. Analysis of specific skills and content related to this issue is currently ongoing, however, teachers have already begun to address this in their classrooms by emphasizing those skills in daily practice.

Though midterm and year-end assessment data is valuable in assessing learning and informing programs, Barker Road places an emphasis on frequent, on-going formative assessment to inform instruction and communicate levels of progress to teachers, students and parents. Our professional development program (which will be addressed more specifically in the next section) offers ample opportunity for teachers to work collaboratively and one area of emphasis has been formative assessment. This has resulted in innovative ideas being utilized across grades and disciplines. For example, our 6th grade math teachers began a process whereby students took a pre-assessment several days prior to a unit test. Students then self-corrected this pre-assessment, identified strengths and areas for improvement, met with the teacher to develop a plan to address areas of need, brought the plan home for parents to review, and implemented the plan prior to taking the unit assessment. This resulted in such positive growth that the model has been employed in other grade levels and curricular areas.

Another example would be the use of Senteo response systems, through which students respond to questions and those responses are reflected via Smartboard technology as well as communicated directly to the teacher in the moment. This allows the teacher to immediately assess understanding, identify

potential confusion and adjust instruction as necessary. Along this line, many of our teachers use Castle Learning as an on-line method of formative assessment. Castle Learning provides students immediate feedback regarding their progress and, like the Senteo system, provides the teacher data on individual students and the class as a whole. These examples reflect the focus at Barker Road on ongoing, embedded formative assessment.

With the introduction of the parent portal in Infinite Campus, which allows parents and students up to the minute access to grades, parents have been very positive in their response. In April, 2011, the district surveyed parents to assess their degree of satisfaction in a number of areas. One area was specifically related to monitoring student progress. Over ninety percent of parents responded positively to the item, "I am informed of my child's academic progress on a regular basis". This was significantly higher than the national average on the same survey.

Overall, Barker Road prides itself on the use of data to inform instruction and communicate levels of progress to teachers, parents and, most important, our students.

## 3. Sharing Lessons Learned:

There are a variety of ways in which we work to share best practices with other schools, but perhaps our greatest emphasis recently has been collaboration with Mendon High School, for which we are the feeder school. Several initiatives that began at Barker Road impacted Mendon as students transitioned from middle to high school.

One example is the use of the parent portal in our student management system, Infinite Campus. Barker Road was the first school in the district to provide access to grades to both parents and students; this began four years ago. This initially caused some trepidation on the part of staff in the district, however, staff at Barker Road were open to this initiative. Since that time, feedback was gathered from staff, parents and students at Barker and shared with the high school. The results were nearly universally positive. As a consequence, the high school followed Barker's lead and opened their portal to parents and students two years ago. This year, all schools in Pittsford provide such access.

In addition to the parent portal, Barker Road took a lead in exploring and implementing standards-based grading practices. This work began with a specific focus on the role of homework. After a year of study and collaborative inquiry into the topic of homework, it was agreed that homework would be utilized as formative assessment, aimed at providing feedback to students on their progress towards meeting standards. Further, it was agreed that homework would not be used as a tool to regulate student behavior. This work was done in conjunction with the high school and with our sister middle school, Calkins Road.

Finally, as a New York State School to Watch, Barker Road has hosted visitors from across New York State who wish to learn from the work we do here. This June, a group from Barker Road will be traveling to Washington, D.C., as a result of our recent designation, to present on the work we have done regarding adoption of the Common Core Learning Standards.

#### 4. Engaging Families and Communities:

At Barker Road, we are truly fortunate to be supported by a community that values education and prides itself on supporting schools through active involvement and engagement. We believe that the key to engaging families and the community is through open communication and ongoing dialogue. To achieve this, we have employed a number of strategies, including the use of technology, coordination with our PTSA and building connections with community organizations.

Technology has opened the door to increased communication between the school and the broader community. Our website is comprehensive and aims to provide resources to parents and the community

through a user-friendly, visually appealing and up to date site (http://pittsfordschools.org/BRMS.cfm). Linked to this site are individual teacher websites, where parents can get up to the date information on each course. In addition, nearly all of our parents have signed on to our Infinite Campus site, through which they can regularly monitor student progress by accessing the grade portal. Realizing the growth of Facebook as an interactive tool, Barker Road will be piloting a page in the fall as another means of communicating with families and the community.

Electronic communication has a vital role in engagement, however, it is best when working in conjunction with authentic opportunities for collaborative partnership. The PTSA at Barker plays a vital role in supporting our program and providing parents with a chance to be involved in their child's life at school. Our PTSA meets monthly and this venue provides an excellent opportunity to keep parents informed as well as providing a forum for questions and concerns to be brought forward. Our PTSA also sends out an electronic newsletter each week, coordinated with the school. Several times each year, our PTSA hosts activity nights for our students. These are held at school, planned and chaperoned by parents, with the support of school personnel. This partnership is a key to the success of Barker Road.

Most recently, we have piloted the use of Edmodo, a safe, adult supervised social networking device that allows students and families to communicate virtually with teachers and their class. We are excited about the potential of this new avenue for communication and engagement between families and the community.

#### 1. Curriculum:

Our Barker Road Comprehensive Action Plan (CAP) for 2011 – 2012 focuses on the implementation of the Common Core Learning Standards, which were adopted by New York State and frame our curricular work across grades and content areas. This provides a perfect context for articulating the overview of our school's core curriculum.

Barker Road is organized by core curricular teams; each team consists of teachers of ELA, social studies, math and science. Teams meet daily and this facilitates cross-curricular planning. We do not follow a prescribed reading curriculum. Our ELA and social studies curriculum are aligned with the CCLS. Students engage in whole group reading, reading circles, and independent reading. Whole group is targeted at grade level; for example, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* is a common text at 7th grade. Scaffolding is provided for students reading below grade level and enrichment activities are provided for students reading above grade level. Reading circles are differentiated and students are grouped by level and interest, with some choice provided for reading titles. Finally, independent reading is most closely targeted at individual students' reading levels. Most of the literature in ELA is connected thematically to units of study in social studies and non-fiction texts that align to those themes are included throughout the year.

Our math curriculum has been redesigned to align with the CCLS. Central to this work has been the development of common formative assessments to determine readiness levels. At each grade level, we offer a course directly aligned with the CCLS and an honors level that enriches the curriculum further for those students at a higher degree of readiness. For students below grade level in math, we offer both pushin and pull-out support, provided by a certified math teacher. Further, we have one section at grades seven and eight that offers smaller group instruction designed to close the gap for those students who are more than one grade level behind. Students in the honors track have the opportunity to take Regents Integrated Algebra in eighth grade; nearly forty percent of students at Barker Road successfully complete Integrated Algebra prior to entering high school.

Similar to math, our science program offers a course at grade level and an honors level course beginning at grade seven. Sixth grade is a general science, seventh grade is chemistry and eighth grade is physics. At the eighth grade, we offer Regents Earth Science as well; about one quarter of our students complete Earth Science prior to entering high school. We offer science support, provided by a certified science teacher, at each grade level for those students struggling to stay at grade level in their science study.

In addition to one period of study in each core area every day, our schedule includes an enrichment period. Each day, students rotate through one of the core areas for a second period of study. This offers an opportunity to supplement or enrich the curriculum based upon student need.

Students begin study of a World Language, Spanish, French or Latin, in the sixth grade. At sixth grade, students study language every other day; at seventh and eighth grade, students study every day. Students take the Second Language Proficiency exam at the conclusion of eighth grade, qualifying them for one unit of World Language study.

We offer a variety of courses beyond the core, designed to provide students a rich, comprehensive curriculum. Students study art at each grade level. Health is studied in grades six and eight. Students study Home and Careers in grades six and seven. Technology is a two year program for students in seventh and eighth grade. Students take physical education every other day, grades six through eight. Finally, music is offered in a variety of ways. Students take general music study in grades six and seven.

Chorus is offered in grades six through eight, both during the school day and after school. Band and orchestra are offered grades six through eight, all during the school day. Overall, more than two thirds of students at Barker take music, beyond general music, during their middle school years.

The development of a comprehensive, articulated curriculum has long been a priority in the district and at Barker Road. That work is ongoing as we strive to continue to provide a world class program for our students.

#### 2. Reading/English:

The English/Language Arts curriculum at Barker Road is developed in alignment with the Common Core Learning Standards. Current emphasis is on reading higher level, non-fiction texts. Teachers have introduced these texts within their ELA classrooms; additionally, utilizing our team structure, social studies teachers have worked in collaboration with ELA teachers to specifically address literacy skills in reading non-fiction.

Our ELA department works closely together to ensure a well articulated curriculum, grades 6-8. Through our standards program, this curriculum is aligned with our sister middle school and the two high schools. Common assessments are given multiple times each year at each grade level to provide data to assess students' progress towards the standards. This data informs instruction and helps identify students who may be reading below grade level.

Built into our daily schedule is an Enrichment period, where students rotate through each curricular area for one period each week to supplement the curriculum. It is often through Enrichment that students who are below grade level receive additional, targeted instruction, following an RtI model, to address literacy. Further, we have two designated reading teachers who provide direct and indirect support to students in need of additional instruction.

Through a collaborative, co-teaching model, students with IEP's receive instruction in the general education setting and receive additional support through a designated resource period. In alignment with the CCLS, our resource room teachers focus explicitly on literacy assessment and instruction. In this way, we look to ensure that all students leave Barker Road at or above grade level in reading so that they are on the path towards college and career readiness.

One exciting element of our ELA curriculum centers on the extensive use of reading circles. Students are given choice around a novel to read and work collaboratively with their group to set a schedule and organize and facilitate discussion about their books. Our focus on literacy across content has helped preserve this valuable practice, allowing our ELA teachers to maintain elements of literature study within their curriculum, while also helping with the shift towards non-fiction texts in conjunction with peers in other departments.

## 3. Mathematics:

The adoption of the Common Core Learning Standards has been a key in curriculum development in the area of math. Curriculum review is ongoing in Pittsford, but the emphasis has shifted in math, with focus, coherence, fluency, deep understanding, application and dual intensity driving the work. There continues to be a strong emphasis on vertical articulation of curriculum, linking work at the middle level with the elementary and high school.

Our results on state assessments demonstrate that our efforts in the area of math have led to a high degree of student success. This results from a thoughtful progress of skills and content, K-12. Additionally, the math program at Barker is designed to meet individual student's needs, with an eye on addressing those students who might be below grade level standard and those that are above. We work in close cooperation

with the three elementary schools that feed into Barker to ensure that students are optimally placed in sixth grade mathematics. We also offer flexibility for students to move between levels, depending upon their needs.

We offer layered support for students who are below grade level in math, following an RtI model. We have two full time staff members specifically dedicated to providing support for students to help address gaps in understanding and keep students on pace for graduation.

Our middle school curriculum emphasizes mastery of math facts, fluency and specifically emphasizes readiness for progression to algebra and geometry. Roughly half of our eighth graders are ready for high school algebra by the time they reach eighth grade; these students consistently perform well above the state average on the high school exam in algebra.

We have an increasing number of students who enter middle school well advanced in mathematics. Working with the elementary schools, under the guidance of teachers who specialize in enrichment, a number of students enter sixth grade double accelerated in math. This program began four years ago in response to the needs of advanced students. These students will complete high school algebra and geometry prior to leaving eighth grade.

Our math curriculum is designed to address the varying needs of our students. This will continue to be an emphasis and we further align with the new CCLS.

#### 4. Additional Curriculum Area:

There are a number of additional curriculum areas that we could focus on for this section as we have attempted to take a comprehensive approach to alignment with the CCLS. The area that has perhaps made the most profound change has been social studies. It was clear in our early work related to the Common Core, that the emphasis on higher level, non-fiction text, would require close coordination between ELA and social studies. Our team structure facilitated this work, with the CCLS guiding our curricular revision.

The curriculum in middle school social studies begins with world history in sixth grade and American history divided between seventh and eighth grades. Our social studies teachers began work last year, in cooperation with colleagues across the district, in reviewing curriculum against the CCLS and identifying gaps, particularly in the area of high level, non-fiction texts. Resources provided by the State Education Department helped inform the work. As learning objectives were adapted, the need for revision of common assessments became the focus. At both the seventh and eighth grades, common midterm and final exams were revised. This resulted in an increased level of rigor. Each assessment included a Document Based Question and Constructed Response, in alignment with state assessments.

By coordinating the focus on literacy between ELA and social studies, we better ensure that students are drawing connections across content, receiving appropriate, challenging non-fiction texts to analyze, while preserving the role of literature in the ELA classroom by not expecting that course to take the exclusive role in literacy education. This collaboration has also contributed to strengthening the professional learning community approach to planning and preparation that is an emphasis at Barker Road.

At several points throughout the year, our students engage in joint projects between ELA and social studies, including research. For example, our 8th grade students recently completed a joing project centered on the progressive era. Each students selected a key historical figure from the period and conducted research on his or her specific impact on American history. This was a coordinated project between ELA and social studies, with a goal of providing a comprehensive experience in historical research. This allows students to see greater connections between the subject areas and provides an opportunity for more flexibility in the use of time in our schedule. Our social studies curriculum serves as

a good example of the coordination of efforts among teachers at Barker Road as we work together to ensure that all students are on the path to college and career readiness.

#### 5. Instructional Methods:

Barker Road places great emphasis on teachers learning from teachers and the area of differentiation is a good example. One of our largest sub-groups consists of students with IEP's. We continue our efforts each year to be more inclusive; this has resulted in greater diversity of learning needs on the part of our students and greater cooperation between learning specialists in the area of special education and our general education teachers. Our co-teaching model emphasizes differentiation of instruction.

Our schedule allows for built in time for teachers to co-plan lessons. In this model, our general education teachers take a lead in devising the content element of lessons, while our learning specialists bring expertise in various instructional models. Meeting several times each week, our co-teaching teams work to ensure that lessons address multiple modalities. This team approach has also facilitated the effective incorporation of technology.

Many of our students favor visual aids; each of our classrooms is equipped with a Smartboard and all teachers have been trained in the effective use of this technology. Other students struggle with auditory processing. We have focused on installing sound systems in various classrooms to improve students' reception of teacher instruction. Targeted grouping of students, based upon formative assessment data, is another method commonly used in classrooms. Though our learning specialists focus on the individual needs of students based upon their IEP goals, the strategies they employ often benefit all students.

Differentiation begins with a clear understanding of individual student's progress related to a stated objective. As a result, work on differentiation at Barker Road is closely tied to our RtI initiative through which teachers utilize formative assessments to continually monitor student progress. This is true for general education and special education students. Each of our teaching teams works in conjunction with a learning specialist, so the focus on differentiation extends beyond co-teaching classrooms.

Our goal is to have a clear understanding of each student's individual progress towards the learning standards and provide appropriate, targeted instruction based upon assessment data. This can present a challenge to the classroom teacher, but our model of co-teaching and collaboration enhances teachers' understanding of varying methods of instruction to address a wide range of student needs.

## 6. Professional Development:

The two key terms related to professional development at Barker Road are ongoing and embedded. We have a robust teacher center that provides targeted professional development programs as well as a number of built-in structures that foster collegiality and teacher led development. As a result, our teaching staff takes a lead in setting the direction for their professional growth plans and providing evidence of progress.

Each year, teachers are required to complete at least twelve hours of professional development; the majority of our staff completes far more. Teachers develop their own plans each year, in coordination with their building principal and in alignment with district or building initiatives. As a result, the professional development program is not a cafeteria menu approach, but a coordinated and focused program.

Teachers begin by setting two growth targets each year; one is created in coordination with a building initiative. At Barker, our building target relates to aligning curriculum with the CCLS. Teachers then develop a plan to meet that target. This can take the form of collegial circles, peer coaching, observing colleagues in or out of district, collaborative journaling, attending professional development programs

that directly relate to their target or other ideas developed by the teacher, often in cooperation with one or more colleagues. The central theme of the approach is that teachers have a great deal to offer one another and learn best when working in cooperation with colleagues in a way that translates immediately back to the classroom.

In addition to teacher professional development plans, there is a strong emphasis in the district and at Barker in making optimal use of existing meeting time. Gone are the days of reviewing procedural items at faculty meetings. Our last meeting consisted of teachers working together, across teams and across curricular areas to review scenarios in which students were struggling to meet learning standards and develop a plan, following an RtI model, to assist that student. The goal was to share best practices and increase consistency across teams and departments relative to RtI.

A comprehensive professional development program focuses on key initiatives, coordinates the efforts of the professional staff, encourages collaboration and measures growth. All of those elements are present in the Barker Road model.

## 7. School Leadership:

Barker Road honors the critical role of teacher leaders and emphasizes shared responsibility in the success of the school, with the principal facilitating the daily operations and acting as the key instructional leader, keeping all stakeholders focused on improving teaching and learning. The school has established structures to foster shared leadership, including our Instructional Leadership Team, which acts as the shared decision making body for the school, Department Leader Team, which oversees curricular assessment and development and Team Leaders, who facilitate efforts towards cross-curricular integration.

Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) is primarily responsible for developing the building Comprehensive Action Plans, which focus the efforts of all stakeholders, as well as monitoring progress towards the goals outlined in those plans. The team consists of the building principal and assistant principal, teacher leaders from each department and grade level, and parent representatives. Though students do not sit on the ILT, work of the committee is shared with our student council. This forum allows for key stakeholders to have a say in the operation of the school. For example, our ILT worked together to provide input into the narrative elements of this application. The team is responsible this year for our work on CCLS alignment and implementation of RtI.

The Department Leader Team follows the lead of the ILT, with a more specific focus on curricular issues. From the plan for CCLS alignment, for example, department leaders led the effort to unroll the use of the template that is assisting us in assessing current alignment to the new standards across grade levels and content areas.

Our Team Leaders are focused this year on the implementation of RtI. Each grade level is made up of two or three teams, each of about 110 students; the core teachers on those teams meet daily. It was natural for collaboration around RtI to occur at the team level. Plans are developed, data is assessed and progress monitored via teams. Team leaders play a vital role in ensuring that non-core teachers are part of the development, implementation and tracking of plans.

These are a few examples of the culture of shared leadership at Barker. At the same time, the building principal is ultimately responsible for assessing the functioning of the leadership teams as well as supervision of staff. This collegial culture has facilitated our growth as a community of learners.

# **PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 6 Test: NYSTP Mathematics 6 Edition/Publication Year: Annual Publisher: NY State Testing Program

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-200 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Testing Month                              | Apr         | Apr         | Apr       | Apr       | Apr      |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 93          | 85          | 98        | 96        | 93       |
| Level 4                                    | 63          | 51          | 55        | 62        | 42       |
| Number of students tested                  | 235         | 230         | 243       | 240       | 255      |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 99          | 100       | 100       | 99       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 1           | 1           | 0         | 0         | 1        |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |          |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  | 5           | 6           | 4         | 4         | 4        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  | 8           | 4           | 3         | 7         | 9        |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             | 90          |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             | 40          |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  | 5           | 10          | 1         | 5         | 1        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 67          | 42          | 76        | 73        | 33       |
| Level 4                                    | 11          | 21          | 24        | 10        | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 18          | 24          | 17        | 19        | 15       |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  | 1           | 1           |           | 3         | 2        |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 93          | 100         | 100       | 100       | 94       |
| Level 4                                    | 89          | 71          | 68        | 78        | 67       |
|  | 28          | 31          | 19        | 23        | 18       |

Subject: Reading Grade: 6 Test: NYSTP ELA 6 Edition/Publication Year: Annual Publisher: NY State Testing Program

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Apr         | Apr         | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 88          | 87          | 98        | 92        | 94        |
| Level 4                                    | 14          | 20          | 23        | 12        | 27        |
| Number of students tested                  | 235         | 231         | 242       | 239       | 254       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 99          | 100       | 99        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 1           | 2           | 0         | 1         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             | <u> </u>  |           | -         |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 3           | 6           | 5         | 4         | 4         |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             | ·         |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 4           | 4           | 3         | 7         | 9         |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 100         | 100         |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    | 20          | 20          |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 10          | 10          | 2         | 4         | 1         |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 48          | 51          | 89        | 36        | 67        |
| Level 4                                    | 0           | 4           | 5         | 0         | 7         |
| Number of students tested                  | 25          | 27          | 19        | 19        | 15        |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             | <u> </u>  |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 1           | 1           |           | 2         | 1         |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 90          | 90          | 100       | 87        | 89        |
| Level 4                                    | 32          | 10          | 17        | 17        | 50        |
|  | 31          | 31          | 18        | 23        | 18        |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 7 Test: NYSTP Mathematics 7 Edition/Publication Year: Annual Publisher: NY State Testing Program

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Apr         | Apr         | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 92          | 91          | 99        | 98        | 93        |
| Level 4                                    | 55          | 57          | 60        | 56        | 37        |
| Number of students tested                  | 245         | 243         | 235       | 254       | 244       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 99          | 99        | 100       | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 1           | 1           | 1         | 0         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 9           | 5           | 1         | 4         | 4         |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 5           | 4           | 5         | 8         | 7         |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 100         |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    | 36          |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 11          | 3           | 7         | 2         | 3         |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 54          | 65          | 90        | 75        |           |
| Level 4                                    | 23          | 20          | 10        | 6         |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 26          | 20          | 20        | 16        | 9         |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 1           |             |           | 1         | 2         |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 100         | 100         | 100       | 95        | 100       |
| Level 4                                    | 71          | 85          | 79        | 68        | 75        |
| Number of students tested                  | 31          | 20          | 24        | 19        | 20        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Reading Grade: 7 Test: NYSTP ELA 7
Edition/Publication Year: Annual Publisher: NY State Testing Program

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Apr         | Apr         | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 87          | 83          | 97        | 96        | 91        |
| Level 4                                    | 19          | 23          | 20        | 9         | 16        |
| Number of students tested                  | 245         | 239         | 235       | 255       | 243       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 99          | 100       | 99        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 2           | 1           | 0         | 1         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           | ·         |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-ecor     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 9           | 5           | 1         | 4         | 4         |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 5           | 4           | 5         | 8         | 7         |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 82          |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    | 27          |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 11          | 3           | 7         | 2         | 3         |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 50          | 51          | 89        | 36        |           |
| Level 4                                    | 0           | 4           | 5         | 0         |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 26          | 27          | 19        | 19        | 9         |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       | <u> </u>    |             |           |           | <u>-</u>  |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 1           | 1           |           | 1         | 2         |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 97          | 85          | 100       | 100       | 75        |
| Level 4                                    | 24          | 25          | 8         | 21        | 15        |
| Number of students tested                  | 29          | 20          | 24        | 19        | 20        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |
|  | 12NI        |             |           |           |           |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 8 Test: NYSTP Mathematics 8 Edition/Publication Year: Annual Publisher: NY State Testing Program

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-200 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Testing Month                              | Apr         | Apr         | Apr       | Apr       | Apr      |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 92          | 89          | 99        | 98        | 91       |
| Level 4                                    | 46          | 37          | 40        | 42        | 31       |
| Number of students tested                  | 248         | 240         | 253       | 247       | 233      |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 99          | 100       | 99        | 100      |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 1           | 1           | 0         | 1         | 0        |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |          |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  | 5           | 2           | 5         | 5         | 5        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           | 80       |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           | 10       |
| Number of students tested                  | 4           | 4           | 7         | 7         | 10       |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  | 4           | 6           | 2         | 4         | 4        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 45          | 48          | 94        | 80        | 54       |
| Level 4                                    | 18          | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| Number of students tested                  | 22          | 21          | 16        | 10        | 22       |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           | ·        |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           | 1         |          |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 100         | 93          | 100       | 100       | 93       |
| Level 4                                    | 78          | 63          | 74        | 80        | 57       |
|  | 23          | 27          | 19        | 20        | 14       |

Subject: Reading Grade: 8 Test: NYSTP ELA 8 Edition/Publication Year: Annual Publisher: NY State Testing Program

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-200 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Testing Month                              | Apr         | Apr         | Apr       | Apr       | Apr      |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 86          | 81          | 95        | 88        | 88       |
| Level 4                                    | 6           | 21          | 20        | 15        | 19       |
| Number of students tested                  | 248         | 241         | 255       | 247       | 233      |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 100         | 99        | 100       | 100      |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 1           | 0           | 1         | 0         | 0        |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0        |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           | ·        |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  | 5           | 2           | 5         | 5         | 4        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           | 73       |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           | 18       |
| Number of students tested                  | 4           | 4           | 8         | 9         | 11       |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  | 4           | 6           | 4         | 8         | 4        |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 50          | 24          | 61        | 20        | 93       |
| Level 4                                    | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 20       |
| Number of students tested                  | 22          | 21          | 18        | 10        | 22       |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |          |
| Number of students tested                  |             |             |           |           |          |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           |          |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 91          | 84          | 95        | 100       | 93       |
| Level 4                                    | 4           | 40          | 19        | 33        | 36       |
|  | 23          | 25          | 21        | 18        | 14       |

Subject: Mathematics Grade: Weighted Average

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010    | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Apr         | Apr          | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |              |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 92          | 88           | 98        | 97        | 92        |
| Level 4                                    | 54          | 48           | 51        | 53        | 36        |
| Number of students tested                  | 728         | 713          | 731       | 741       | 732       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 99           | 99        | 99        | 99        |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 3           | 3            | 1         | 1         | 1         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |              |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stud | dents     |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 94          | 53           | 90        | 92        | 69        |
| Level 4                                    | 36          | 30           | 30        | 23        | 15        |
| Number of students tested                  | 19          | 13           | 10        | 13        | 13        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |              |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 70          | 41           | 86        | 86        | 73        |
| Level 4                                    | 23          | 25           | 0         | 18        | 11        |
| Number of students tested                  | 17          | 12           | 15        | 22        | 26        |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |              |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 95          | 78           | 100       | 81        |           |
| Level 4                                    | 34          | 26           | 30        | 18        |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 20          | 19           | 10        | 11        | 8         |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |              |           |           | ·         |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 54          | 51           | 86        | 75        | 40        |
| Level 4                                    | 18          | 13           | 11        | 6         | 0         |
| Number of students tested                  | 66          | 65           | 53        | 45        | 46        |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |              |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |              |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |              |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 2           | 1            | 0         | 5         | 4         |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |              |           |           | <u>-</u>  |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 97          | 97           | 100       | 98        | 96        |
| Level 4                                    | 79          | 71           | 74        | 75        | 67        |
| Number of students tested                  | 82          | 78           | 62        | 62        | 52        |

Subject: Reading Grade: Weighted Average

|  | 2010-2011   | 2009-2010   | 2008-2009 | 2007-2008 | 2006-2007 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Testing Month                              | Apr         | Apr         | Apr       | Apr       | Apr       |
| SCHOOL SCORES                              |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 86          | 83          | 96        | 92        | 91        |
| Level 4                                    | 12          | 21          | 20        | 11        | 20        |
| Number of students tested                  | 728         | 711         | 732       | 741       | 730       |
| Percent of total students tested           | 99          | 99          | 99        | 99        | 100       |
| Number of students alternatively assessed  | 4           | 3           | 1         | 2         | 0         |
| Percent of students alternatively assessed | 0           | 0           | 0         | 0         | 0         |
| SUBGROUP SCORES                            |             |             |           |           |           |
| 1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-econ     | omic Disadv | antaged Stu | dents     |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 64          | 47          | 72        | 76        | 78        |
| Level 4                                    | 0           | 9           | 0         | 0         | 16        |
| Number of students tested                  | 17          | 13          | 11        | 13        | 12        |
| 2. African American Students               |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 30          | 16          | 68        | 78        | 77        |
| Level 4                                    | 0           | 0           | 0         | 4         | 14        |
| Number of students tested                  | 13          | 12          | 16        | 24        | 27        |
| 3. Hispanic or Latino Students             |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 88          | 89          | 84        | 64        |           |
| Level 4                                    | 23          | 10          | 23        | 7         |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 25          | 19          | 13        | 14        | 8         |
| 4. Special Education Students              |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 49          | 43          | 80        | 32        | 74        |
| Level 4                                    | 0           | 2           | 3         | 0         | 11        |
| Number of students tested                  | 73          | 75          | 56        | 48        | 46        |
| 5. English Language Learner Students       |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 3 & 4                                |             |             |           |           |           |
| Level 4                                    |             |             |           |           |           |
| Number of students tested                  | 2           | 2           | 0         | 3         | 3         |
| 6. Asian                                   |             |             |           |           | ·         |
| Level 3 & 4                                | 92          | 86          | 98        | 95        | 84        |
| Level 4                                    | 21          | 23          | 14        | 23        | 32        |
| Number of students tested                  | 83          | 76          | 63        | 60        | 52        |
| NOTES:                                     |             |             |           |           |           |